

REMARKS

Claim 4 is amended. Minor changes are made to the specification to correct typographical errors pointed to by the examiner. Thus, by this amendment, Claims 1 through 10 are presented for examination as amended.

New drawings are submitted in accordance with the Examiner's requirement to add a "Prior Art" legend to Figure 2.

In the pending office action, the Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1 and 7 on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 2 through 6 and 8 through 10 were objected to for dependence upon rejected base claims but indicated to contain allowable subject matter.

Applicant respectfully traverses the double patenting rejection which is based upon the then-pending Claims 1 and 7 of United States patent application 10/553,268 ('268 Application). The Examiner is also examiner in the '268 Application. Such claims were changed in an amendment filed February 5, 2007 in the '268 Application to read as follows (markings indicating changes made to the claims are included for the Examiner's convenience):

1. A method for determination of a zero error in a Coriolis gyro in which:

- the resonator of the Coriolis gyro has appropriate disturbance forces applied to it such that at least one natural oscillation of the resonator is stimulated, which differs from the stimulating oscillation and from the read oscillation of the resonator, ~~and~~
- a change in a read signal which represents the read oscillation and results from the stimulation of at least one natural oscillation is determined as a measure of the zero error, and
- the disturbance forces are alternating forces at appropriate disturbance frequencies, with the disturbance frequencies being natural oscillation frequencies of the resonator.

7. A Coriolis gyro characterized by a device for determination of the zero error of the Coriolis gyro having:

- a disturbance unit which applies appropriate disturbance forces to a ~~the~~ resonator of the Coriolis gyro such that at least one natural oscillation of the resonator is stimulated, which differs from the stimulating oscillation and the read oscillation of the resonator, ~~and~~
- a disturbance signal detection unit, which determines a disturbance component, which is contained in a read signal that represents the read oscillation and has been produced by the

stimulation of the at least one natural oscillation, as a measure of the zero error, and

- the disturbance forces are alternating forces at appropriate disturbance frequencies, with the disturbance frequencies being natural oscillation frequencies of the resonator.

From the above, it is clear that the disturbance forces set forth in Claims 1 and 7 of the '268 Application are alternating forces at appropriate disturbance frequencies. The disturbance frequencies are natural oscillation frequencies of the resonator. In contrast, in Claims 1 and 7 of the present application the disturbance force changes the stimulation oscillation whereas, in claims 1 and 7 of the '268 Application, a disturbance force is applied which does not change the stimulation oscillation (which has its own frequency) but, rather, stimulates another oscillation with another frequency. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 7 of the present application define inventions that are non-obvious, and therefore patentably distinct from the inventions now defined by claims 1 and 7 respectively of the '269 Application.

For the foregoing reasons, all presently-pending claims of this application clearly define patentable subject matter.

Serial No. 10/531,811 . . . . . Page 13

Prompt allowance and issuance of all such claims is therefore  
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Elliott N. Kramsky", written in a cursive style.

Elliott N. Kramsky  
Registration 27,812  
Attorney for Applicant